arXiv:1402.4276v1 [math.FA] 18 Feb 2014

Some results of the Lipschitz constant of 1-Field on $\mathbb{R}^n$

Erwan Y. Le Gruyer * and Thanh-Viet Phan †

February 19, 2014

Abstract

We study the relations between the Lipschitz constant of 1-field introduced in [12] and the Lipschitz constant of the gradient canonically associated with this 1-field. Moreover, we produce two explicite formulas that make up Minimal Lipschitz extensions for 1-field. As consequence of the previous results, for the problem of minimal extension by continuous functions from $\mathbb{R}^m$ to $\mathbb{R}^n$, we also produce analogous explicite formulas to those of Bauschke and Wang (see [6]). Finally, we show that Wells's extensions of 1-field are absolutely minimal Lipschitz extension when the domain of 1-field to expand is finite. We provide a counter-example showing that this result is false in general.

Mathematics Subject Classification. 54C20, 58C25, 46T20, 49
Key words. Minimal, Lipschitz, Extension, Differentiable Function, Convex Analysis

1 Introduction

Fix $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $n \geq 1$. Let Ω be a non-empty subset of Euclidean space $\mathbb{R}^n$. We denote $\langle , \rangle$ the standard scalar product in $\mathbb{R}^n$. Let $\mathscr{P}^1(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathbb{R})$ be the set of first degree polynomials mapping $\mathbb{R}^n$ to $\mathbb{R}$, i.e

$$\mathscr{P}^1(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathbb{R}) \triangleq \{P : a \in \mathbb{R}^n \mapsto P(a) = p + \langle v, a \rangle \, , where \; p \in \mathbb{R}, v \in \mathbb{R}^n\}.$$

Let us consider a 1-field F on domain $\mathrm{dom}(F) \triangleq \Omega$ defined by

$$\begin{aligned} F : \Omega &\to \mathscr{P}^1(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathbb{R}) \\ x &\mapsto F(x)(a) \triangleq f_x + \langle D_x f; a - x \rangle, \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

where $a \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is the evaluation variable of the polynomial $F(x)$ and $x \in \Omega \mapsto f_x \in \mathbb{R}$, $x \in \Omega \mapsto D_x f \in \mathbb{R}^n$ are mappings associated with F. We will always use capital letters to denote the 1-field and small letters to denote these mappings.

The Lipschitz constant of F introduced in [12] is

$$\Gamma^1(F; \Omega) \triangleq \sup_{\substack{x,y \in \Omega \\ x \neq y}} \Gamma^1(F; x, y), \tag{2}$$

*E. Y. Le Gruyer, INSA de Rennes & IRMAR, 20, Avenue des Buttes de Coësmes, CS 70839 F - 35708 Rennes Cedex 7 , France, (Erwan.Le-Gruyer@insa-rennes.fr)

†T.V. Phan, INSA de Rennes & IRMAR, 20, Avenue des Buttes de Coësmes, CS 70839 F - 35708 Rennes Cedex 7 , France, (Thanh-Viet.Phan@insa-rennes.fr)

where

$$\Gamma^1(F;x,y) \triangleq 2 \sup_{a\in\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{|F(x)(a)-F(y)(a)|}{\|x-a\|^2+\|y-a\|^2}. \tag{3}$$

If $\Gamma^1(F;\Omega) < +\infty$, then the Whitney's conditions [30], [9] are verified and the 1-field F can be extended in $\mathbb{R}^n$: there exists $g \in \mathscr{C}^1(\mathbb{R}^n,\mathbb{R})$ such that $g(x) = f_x$ and $\nabla g(x) = D_x f$ for all $x \in \Omega$ where ∇g is the usual gradient. Moreover, from [12, Theorem 2.6] we can find g which satisfies

$$\Gamma^1(G;\mathbb{R}^n) = \Gamma^1(F;\Omega),$$

where G is the 1-field associated to g, i.e

$$G(x)(y) = g(x) + \langle \nabla g(x), y-x\rangle\,,\ \forall x,y \in \Omega.$$

It means that the Lipschitz constant does not increase when extending F by G. We say that G is a minimal Lipschitz extension (MLE for short) of F and we have

$$\Gamma^1(G;\mathbb{R}^n) = \inf\{\mathrm{Lip}(\nabla h,\mathbb{R}^n)\ :\ h(x) = f_x, \nabla h(x) = D_x f, x \in \Omega,\ h \in \mathscr{C}^{1,1}(\mathbb{R}^n,\mathbb{R})\},$$

where the notation $\mathrm{Lip}(u,.)$ means that

$$\mathrm{Lip}(u;x,y) \triangleq \frac{\|u(x)-u(y)\|}{\|x-y\|},\ x \neq y \in \Omega, \text{ and } \mathrm{Lip}(u;\Omega) \triangleq \sup_{x\neq y\in\Omega} \mathrm{Lip}(u;x,y). \tag{4}$$

It is worth asking what is it the relationship between $\Gamma^1(F,\Omega)$ and $\mathrm{Lip}(Df,\Omega)$? From [12], we know that $\mathrm{Lip}(Df,\Omega) \leq \Gamma^1(F,\Omega)$. In special case $\Omega = \mathbb{R}^n$ we have $\mathrm{Lip}(Df,\mathbb{R}^n) = \Gamma^1(F,\mathbb{R}^n)$ but in general the formula $\mathrm{Lip}(Df,\Omega) = \Gamma^1(F,\Omega)$ is untrue. In this paper we will prove that if Ω is an non empty open subset of $\mathbb{R}^n$ then

$$\Gamma^1(F,\Omega) = \max\{\Gamma^1(F,\partial\Omega), \mathrm{Lip}(Df,\Omega)\}, \tag{5}$$

where $\partial\Omega$ is a boundary of Ω.
Moreover if Ω is a convex subset of $\mathbb{R}^n$ then

$$\Gamma^1(F,\Omega) \leq 2\mathrm{Lip}(Df,\Omega). \tag{6}$$

Knowing the set of uniqueness of minimal extensions of a taylonian biponctual field, allows better understand the relation between $\Gamma^1(F)$ and $\mathrm{Lip}(Df)$. For further more details see Section 3.

In Section 4, we present two MLEs U^+ and U^- of F of the form

$$U^+ : x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mapsto U^+(x)(a) \triangleq u^+(x) + \langle D_x u^+; a-x\rangle, a \in \mathbb{R}^n.$$

where

$$u^+(x) \triangleq \max_{v\in\Lambda_x} \inf_{a\in\Omega} \Psi^+(F,x,a,v), \quad D_x u^+ \triangleq \arg\max_{v\in\Lambda_x} \inf_{a\in\Omega} \Psi^+(F,x,a,v),$$

and

$$U^- : x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mapsto U^-(x)(a) \triangleq u^-(x) + \langle D_x u^-; a-x\rangle,\ a \in \mathbb{R}^n,$$

where

$$u^-(x) \triangleq \min_{v\in\Lambda_x} \sup_{a\in\Omega} \Psi^-(F,x,a,v), \quad D_x u^- \triangleq \arg\min_{v\in\Lambda_x} \sup_{a\in\Omega} \Psi^-(F,x,a,v),$$

where Λ_x is a non empty and convex set of $\mathbb{R}^n$, defined in Definition 14. These maps and their gradients are explicit sup-inf formulas that is to say they only depend on F. In addition they are *extremal* : the first is *over* and the second is *under* that is to say

$$u^-(x) \le g_x \le u^+(x),\ \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^n,$$

for all MLE G of F.

Now, we draw the connection between the formula u^+ and the formula of Wells [28]. From [28, Theorem 2], we know that if $\kappa > 0$ satisfies

$$f_y \le f_x + \frac{1}{2}\langle D_x f + D_y f, y-x\rangle + \frac{\kappa}{4}(x-y)^2 - \frac{1}{4\kappa}(D_x f - D_y f)^2, \forall x,y \in \Omega,$$

then there exists $w^+ \in \mathscr{C}^{1,1}(\mathbb{R}^n,\mathbb{R})$ such that $w^+(x) = f_x$, $\nabla w^+(x) = D_x f$ for all $x \in \Omega$, and $\mathrm{Lip}(\nabla w^+, \mathbb{R}^n) \le \kappa$.

Further, if $g \in \mathscr{C}^{1,1}(\mathbb{R}^n,\mathbb{R})$ with $g(x) = f_x$, $\nabla g(x) = D_x f$ for all $x \in \Omega$ and $\mathrm{Lip}(\nabla g, \mathbb{R}^n) \le \kappa$, then $g(x) \le w^+(x)$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$.

The construction of Wells w^+ is explicit when Ω is finite. The construction of Wells extend to infinite Ω by passing to the limit but there is no explicit formula. In sections 4 and 7, we will prove that if κ is assigned the Lipschitz constant of the field F, then w^+ is a MLE. Further, in this case w^+ is an over extremal extension of F and $u^+ = w^+$. We find a function w^- (similarly from the construction of w^+) and we have $u^- = w^-$.

We pay attention to the case when Ω is finite. Say it is interesting despite this restrictive assumption. In this case we have explicit constructions of $w^\pm$. In section 6, we will prove that $w^\pm$ are absolutely minimal Lipschitz extensions (AMLEs for short) of F. This means that for any bounded open D satisfying $\overline{D} \subset \mathbb{R}^n \backslash \Omega$ we have

$$\Gamma^1(w^\pm, D) = \Gamma^1(w^\pm, \partial D). \tag{7}$$

These result give the existence of AMLEs of F when Ω is finite. In general one dose not have uniqueness since it may happen $w^- < w^+$. In fact, we even have infinity solutions AMLE of F (see Corollary 29).

When Ω is infinite, w^+ and w^- are extremal MLE, but in general are not AMLE of F. To prove this, we present, in section 6, an example of mapping F for which w^+ and w^- are not AMLE of F. In this particular example, we can check that $\frac{1}{2}(w^+ + w^-)$ is the unique AMLE of F, moreover this function is not $\mathscr{C}^2$ although the domain Ω of F is regular and F is a regular 1-field. The question of the existence of an AMLE remains an open and a difficult problem when Ω is infinite see [14] and the references therein.

In Section 5, we explain how to use the previous ideas and methods to construct MLE of mappings from $\mathbb{R}^m$ to $\mathbb{R}^n$, i.e, to solve the Kirszbraun-Valentine extension problem [18, 27]. Let us define first $\mathscr{Q}_0$ as the problem of the minimum extension for Lipschitzian functions, second $\mathscr{Q}_1$

as the problem of the minimum extension for 1-fields. Curiously, we will show that the problem $\mathscr{Q}_0$ is a sub-problem of the problem $\mathscr{Q}_1$. As a consequence, we obtain two explicit formulas see (36) and (37) that solve the problem $\mathscr{Q}_0$.
The Bauschke-Wang result [6] gives an explicite formula for the Kirsbraun-Valentine problem from $\mathbb{R}^m$ to $\mathbb{R}^n$. By our approach, we produce analogous formulas. Moreover, when the domain of the function to extend is finite, the result of Wells gives an explicite construction of minimal Lipschitz extensions.

2 Preliminaries

For any Ω open subset of $\mathbb{R}^n$, denote by $\mathscr{C}^{1,1}(\Omega,\mathbb{R})$ the set of all real-valued function f that is differentiable on Ω and the differential ∇f is lipschitzian, that is $\mathrm{Lip}(\nabla f,\Omega)<+\infty$.

Let Ω be a subset of $\mathbb{R}^n$. The 1-field F of domain Ω is define by (see(1))

$$\begin{aligned} F:\Omega &\to \mathscr{P}^1(\mathbb{R}^n,\mathbb{R}) \\ x &\mapsto F(x)(a)=f_x+\langle D_x f;a-x\rangle, a\in\mathbb{R}^n \end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

with $f_x\in\mathbb{R}$ and $D_x f\in\mathbb{R}^n$, fror all $x\in\mathbb{R}^n$.

Definition 1. We call F to be a Taylorian field on Ω if F is a 1-field on Ω and $\Gamma^1(F,\Omega)<+\infty$.

Denote by $\mathscr{F}^1(\Omega)$ the set of all Taylorian fields on Ω.

Information and precision for the reader : Let Ω be a subset of $\mathbb{R}^n$ and $F\in\mathscr{F}^1(\Omega)$. Let us define the map

$$f(x)\triangleq F(x)(x)=f_x,\ x\in\Omega.$$

Suppose that Ω is open, using [12, Proposition 2.5] we have $f\in\mathscr{C}^{1,1}(\Omega,\mathbb{R})$ and $\nabla f(x)=D_x f$, $\forall x\in\Omega$.
Suppose that Ω is any subset of $\mathbb{R}^n$ then using [12, Theorem 2.6] there exists $\tilde{F}\in\mathscr{F}^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$ which extends F. Moreover $\tilde{f}\in\mathscr{C}^{1,1}(\mathbb{R}^n,\mathbb{R})$ and $\nabla f(x)\triangleq\nabla\tilde{f}(x)=D_x f$, $x\in\Omega$. Conclusion : in all situations, we can canonically associate F and f.

Using the notation $V\subset\subset\Omega$ if $\overline{V}$ is compact and $\overline{V}\subset\Omega$.
Let $x,y\in\mathbb{R}^n$. We define:

$$B(x;r)\triangleq\{y\in\mathbb{R}^n:\|y-x\|<r\}.$$

$$\overline{B(x;r)}\triangleq\{y\in\mathbb{R}^n:\|y-x\|\leq r\}.$$

$B_{1/2}(x,y)$ is the closed ball of center $\frac{x+y}{2}$ and radius $\frac{\|x-y\|}{2}$.
The line segment joining two points x and y is denote by $[x,y]$, i.e $[x,y]\triangleq\{tx+(1-t)y:0\leq t\leq 1\}$.
The $|$ symbol designates in restriction to.

Definition 2. Let Ω be a subset of $\mathbb{R}^n$ and let $F\in\mathscr{F}^1(\Omega)$. For any $a\neq b\in\Omega$, we define

$$\begin{aligned} A_{a,b}(F) &\triangleq \frac{2(f_a-f_b)+\langle D_a f+D_b f,b-a\rangle}{\|a-b\|^2}. \\ B_{a,b}(F) &\triangleq \frac{\|D_a f-D_b f\|}{\|a-b\|}. \end{aligned}$$

Definition 3. Let $\Omega_1 \subset \Omega_2 \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ and $F \in \mathscr{F}^1(\Omega_1)$.

We call $G \in \mathscr{F}^1(\Omega_2)$ a *extension* of F on Ω_2 if $G(x) = F(x)$ for $x \in \Omega_1$.

We say that $G \in \mathscr{F}^1(\Omega_2)$ is a *minimal Lipschitz extension* (MLE) of F on Ω_2 if G is an extension of F on Ω_2 and

$$\Gamma^1(G;\Omega_2) = \Gamma^1(F;\Omega_1).$$

We say that $G_1 \in \mathscr{F}^1(\Omega_2)$ is an *over extremal Lipschitz extension* (over extremal for short) and G_2 is an *under extremal Lipschitz extension* of F on Ω_2 if G_1 and G_2 are MLEs of F on Ω_2 and

$$g_2(x) \leq k(x) \leq g_1(x),\ x \in \Omega_2,$$

for all K MLE of F.

We say that $G \in \mathscr{F}^1(\Omega_2)$ is an *absolutely minimal Lipschitz extension* (AMLE) of F on Ω_2 if G is a MLE of F on Ω_2 and

$$\Gamma^1(G;V) = \Gamma^1(F;\partial V),$$

for any bounded open V satisfying $\overline{V} \subset \Omega_2 \backslash \Omega_1$.

We recall some results in [12] that will be useful in sections 3 and 4:

Proposition 4. *[12, Proposition 2.2 and remark 2.3] Let Ω be a subset of $\mathbb{R}^n$ and let $F \in \mathscr{F}^1(\Omega)$ then for any $a,b \in \Omega, a \neq b$ we have*

$$\Gamma^1(F;a,b) \quad = \quad \sqrt{A_{a,b}(F)^2 + B_{a,b}(F)^2} + \left|A_{a,b}(F)\right| = 2 \sup_{y \in B_{1/2}(a,b)} \frac{F(a)(y) - F(b)(y)}{\|a-y\|^2 + \|b-y\|^2}.$$

Theorem 5. *[12, Theorem 2.6] Let $\Omega_1 \subset \Omega_2 \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ and let $F \in \mathscr{F}^1(\Omega_1)$ then there exists a MLE $G \in \mathscr{F}^1(\Omega_2)$ of F on Ω_2.*

3 Relations between $\Gamma^1(F;\Omega)$ and $\mathrm{Lip}(Df;\Omega)$

In this section Ω is an open subset of $\mathbb{R}^n$. Let $F \in \mathscr{F}^1(\Omega)$.

From Proposition 4, we have $\Gamma^1(F;\Omega) \geq \mathrm{Lip}(Df;\Omega)$. When $\Omega = \mathbb{R}^n$, we know that (see [12, Proposition 2.4])

$$\mathrm{Lip}(Df,\mathbb{R}^n) = \Gamma^1(F,\mathbb{R}^n),$$

but in general $\Gamma^1(F;\Omega)$ may be strictly bigger than $\mathrm{Lip}(Df;\Omega)$. For example, let A and B be open sets in $\mathbb{R}^n$ such that $A \cap B = \emptyset$. Let $\Omega = A \cup B$, then Ω is open. Let $F \in \mathscr{F}^1(\Omega)$ such that $f_x = 0$ if $x \in A$, $f_x = 1$ if $x \in B$, and $D_x f = 0$,$\forall x \in \Omega$. Then $\mathrm{Lip}(Df;\Omega) = 0$ and from Proposition 4 we have

$$\Gamma^1(F;\Omega) = \sup_{x \in A} \sup_{y \in B} \frac{4}{\|x-y\|^2} > 0.$$

We now give two new results where we have $\Gamma^1(F,\Omega) = \mathrm{Lip}(Df,\Omega)$.

Proposition 6. *Let $F \in \mathscr{F}^1(\Omega)$. Suppose there exist $a,b \in \Omega, a \neq b$ such that $\Gamma^1(F;a,b) = \Gamma^1(F;\Omega)$, then $\Gamma^1(F;\Omega) = \mathrm{Lip}(Df;\Omega)$.*

Proof. It is enough to prove that $\Gamma^1(F;\Omega) \leq \mathrm{Lip}(Df;\Omega)$.

Let $G = F|_{\{a,b\}}$ be a Taylorian field on $\mathrm{dom}(G) = \{a,b\}$ with $G(a) = F(a)$ and $G(b) = F(b)$. Let U be a MLE of F on $\mathbb{R}^n$. We have $U(a) = F(a) = G(a)$, $U(b) = F(b) = G(b)$ and $\Gamma^1(U;\mathbb{R}^n) = \Gamma^1(F;\Omega) = \Gamma^1(F;a,b) = \Gamma^1(G;\mathrm{dom}(G))$. Therefore U is a MLE of G on $\mathbb{R}^n$.

Using [14, Lemma 8 and Lemma 10], there exists a point $c \in B_{1/2}(a,b)$ such that

$$\mathrm{Lip}(Du;x,y) = \mathrm{Lip}(Du;s,t) = \Gamma^1(G;a,b) = \Gamma^1(F;a,b), \tag{9}$$

for all $x,y \in [a,c]$ $(x \neq y)$ and $s,t \in [b,c]$ $(s \neq t)$.

Since $a \neq b$, we have $c \neq a$ or $c \neq b$. We can assume $c \neq a$. Because Ω is open, there exists $x \neq y \in [a,c] \cap \Omega$, thus from (9) we have

$$\mathrm{Lip}(Df;\Omega) \geq \mathrm{Lip}(Df;x,y) = \mathrm{Lip}(Du;x,y) = \Gamma^1(F;a,b) = \Gamma^1(F;\Omega).$$

□

Proposition 7. *Let $F \in \mathscr{F}^1(\Omega)$. Suppose there exists $\Omega' \subset\subset \Omega$ such that $\Gamma^1(F;\Omega') = \Gamma^1(F;\Omega)$, then $\Gamma^1(F;\Omega) = \mathrm{Lip}(Df;\Omega)$.*

Proof. Again, it is enough to prove that $\Gamma^1(F;\Omega) \leq \mathrm{Lip}(Df;\Omega)$. Let $h > 0$, we define $\Lambda_h = \{(a,b) \in \overline{\Omega'} \times \overline{\Omega'} : |a-b| \geq h\}$ and $\Gamma^1_h(F;\overline{\Omega'}) = \sup_{(a,b)\in\Lambda_h} \Gamma^1(F;a,b)$. Applying Proposition 4, the mapping $(a,b) \mapsto \Gamma^1(F;a,b)$ is continuous on Λ_h. Moreover, Λ_h is compact, thus there exists $(a_h,b_h) \in \Lambda_h$ such that

$$\Gamma^1(F;a_h,b_h) = \Gamma^1_h(F;\overline{\Omega'}). \tag{10}$$

**Case 1:* There exists $h > 0$ such that

$$\Gamma^1_h(F;\overline{\Omega'}) = \Gamma^1(F;\overline{\Omega'}) \tag{11}$$

From (10),(11) and the condition $\Gamma^1(F;\Omega') = \Gamma^1(F;\Omega)$, we have $\Gamma^1(F;a_h,b_h) = \Gamma^1(F;\Omega)$. Applying Proposition 6 we have $\Gamma^1(F;\Omega) = \mathrm{Lip}(Df;\Omega)$.

**Case 2:* For all $h > 0$, we always have

$$\Gamma^1_h(F;\overline{\Omega'}) < \Gamma^1(F;\overline{\Omega'}). \tag{12}$$

Let $h = 1/n$, then for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$ there exist $(a_n,b_n) \in \Lambda_{1/n}$ such that $\Gamma^1(F;a_n,b_n) = \Gamma^1_{1/n}(F;\overline{\Omega'})$. Since $(a_n),(b_n) \subset \overline{\Omega'}$ and $\overline{\Omega'}$ is compact, there exist a subsequence (a_{n_k}) of (a_n) and a subsequence (b_{n_k}) of (b_n) such that (a_{n_k}) converges to an element a of $\overline{\Omega'}$ and (b_{n_k}) converges to an element b of $\overline{\Omega'}$.

If $a \neq b$ then

$$\Gamma^1(F;\overline{\Omega'}) = \lim_{k\to\infty} \Gamma^1_{1/n_k}(F;\overline{\Omega'}) = \lim_{k\to\infty} \Gamma^1(F;a_{n_k},b_{n_k}) = \Gamma^1(F;a,b).$$

But this is not possible because for $l = |a-b| > 0$ we deduce from (12) that $\Gamma^1(F;a,b) \leq \Gamma^1_l(F;\overline{\Omega'}) < \Gamma^1(F;\overline{\Omega'})$.

Therefore, we must have $a = b$. From the proof of [12, Proposition 2.4], we see that if $B_{1/2}(x,y) \subset \Omega$ then $\Gamma^1(F;x,y) \leq \mathrm{Lip}(Df;\Omega)$. We will use this property for proving in the case

$a = b$. For any $\varepsilon > 0$, since (a_{n_k}) and (b_{n_k}) are both converge to $a \in \overline{\Omega'} \subset \Omega$, there exists $k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $B_{1/2}(a_{n_k}, b_{n_k}) \subset \Omega$ and

$$\varepsilon + \Gamma^1(F; a_{n_k}, b_{n_k}) \geq \Gamma^1(F; \overline{\Omega'}) = \Gamma^1(F; \Omega).$$

Since $B_{1/2}(a_{n_k}, b_{n_k}) \subset \Omega$ we have

$$\Gamma^1(F; a_{n_k}, b_{n_k}) \leq \mathrm{Lip}(Df; \Omega).$$

Therefore

$$\varepsilon + \mathrm{Lip}(Df; \Omega) \geq \Gamma^1(F; \Omega).$$

This inequality holds for any $\varepsilon > 0$, so that we have $\mathrm{Lip}(Df; \Omega) \geq \Gamma^1(F; \Omega)$. □

Proposition 8. *Let Ω be an open and convex set in $\mathbb{R}^n$ and let $F \in \mathscr{F}^1(\Omega)$. Then*

$$\Gamma^1(F; \Omega) \leq 2\,\mathrm{Lip}(Df; \Omega).$$

Proof. Let f be the canonical associate to F. We can write

$$f(x) - f(y) \;=\; \int_0^1 \langle \nabla f(y + t(x-y)), x - y \rangle dt$$

For any $x, y \in \Omega$ and $z \in \mathbb{R}^n$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&F(x)(z) - F(y)(z) \\
&= f(x) - f(y) + \langle \nabla f(x), z - x \rangle - \langle \nabla f(y), z - y \rangle \\
&= \int_0^1 \langle \nabla f(y + t(x-y)) - \nabla f(x), x - z \rangle dt + \int_0^1 \langle \nabla f(y + t(x-y)) - \nabla f(y), z - y \rangle dt.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned}
&|F(x)(z) - F(y)(z)| \\
&\leq \int_0^1 \mathrm{Lip}(\nabla f; \Omega) \|x - y\| \|x - z\| (1 - t) dt + \int_0^1 \mathrm{Lip}(\nabla f; \Omega) \|(x - y)\| \|z - y\| t dt, \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \mathrm{Lip}(\nabla f; \Omega) \|x - y\| (\|x - z\| + \|z - y\|), \\
&\leq \frac{1}{2} \mathrm{Lip}(\nabla f; \Omega) (\|x - z\| + \|z - y\|)^2, \\
&\leq \mathrm{Lip}(\nabla f; \Omega) \left(\|x - z\|^2 + \|z - y\|^2 \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore $\Gamma^1(F; \Omega) \leq 2\,\mathrm{Lip}(\nabla f; \Omega) = 2\,\mathrm{Lip}(Df; \Omega)$. □

From the proof of Proposition 8, we obtain

Corollary 9. *Let Ω be an open and convex set in $\mathbb{R}^n$ and $f \in \mathscr{C}^{1,1}(\Omega, \mathbb{R})$. Then $F \in \mathscr{F}^1(\Omega)$ where F is the 1-field associated to f.*

Lemma 10. *Let $u \in \mathscr{C}^1(\mathbb{R}^n,\mathbb{R})$ then*

$$\mathrm{Lip}(\nabla u;x,y) \leq \inf_{z\in[x,y]} \max\{\mathrm{Lip}(\nabla u;x,z),\mathrm{Lip}(\nabla u;z,y)\},\ \textit{for all } x,y\in\mathbb{R}^n.$$

Proof. Let $x,y\in\Omega$ and $z\in[x,y]$ then we have $\|x-y\| = \|x-z\|+\|z-y\|$. It follows

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{Lip}(\nabla u;x,y) &\leq \frac{\|x-z\|}{\|x-z\|+\|y-z\|}\mathrm{Lip}(\nabla u;x,z) + \frac{\|z-y\|}{\|x-z\|+\|y-z\|}\mathrm{Lip}(\nabla u;z,y),\\ &\leq \max\left\{\mathrm{Lip}(\nabla u;x,z),\mathrm{Lip}(\nabla u;z,y)\right\}.\end{aligned}$$

□

Proposition 11. *There exist Ω open convex set and $F\in\mathscr{F}^1(\Omega)$ such that*

$$\mathrm{Lip}(\nabla f;\Omega) < \Gamma^1(F;\Omega).$$

Proof. We consider in $\mathbb{R}^2$. Let $a=(-1,0), b=(1,0)$. We define $U\in\mathscr{F}^1(\{a,b\})$ as

$$D_a u = (0,1),\ D_b u = (0,-1),\ u_a = \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}},\ u_b = -\frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}.$$

We have $A_{a,b}(U) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}$, $B_{a,b}(U)=1$, and $\Gamma^1(F;\{a,b\}) = \sqrt{3}$.
Using [14, Lemma 7,8], we define

$$\begin{aligned}&\kappa = \Gamma^1(F,\{a,b\}) = \sqrt{3},\\ &c = \frac{a+b}{2} + \frac{D_a u - D_b u}{2\kappa},\\ &\widetilde{u}_c = U(a)(c) - \frac{\kappa}{2}\|a-c\|^2 = U(b)(c) + \frac{\kappa}{2}\|b-c\|^2,\\ &D_c\widetilde{u} = D_a u + \kappa(a-c) = D_b u - \kappa(b-c),\\ &\widetilde{U}(c)(z) = \widetilde{u}_c + \langle D_c\widetilde{u}, z-c\rangle,\ z\in\mathbb{R}^n,\end{aligned}$$

and define

$$f(z) \triangleq \begin{cases} \widetilde{U}(c)(z) - \dfrac{\kappa}{2}\dfrac{\langle z-c,a-c\rangle^2}{\|a-c\|^2}, & \text{if } p(z)\geq 0 \text{ and } q(z)\leq 0,\\ \widetilde{U}(c)(z) + \dfrac{\kappa}{2}\dfrac{\langle z-c,b-c\rangle^2}{\|b-c\|^2}, & \text{if } p(z)\leq 0 \text{ and } q(z)\geq 0,\\ \widetilde{U}(c)(z), & \text{if } p(z)\leq 0 \text{ and } q(z)\leq 0,\\ \widetilde{U}(c)(z) - \dfrac{\kappa}{2}\dfrac{\langle z-c,a-c\rangle^2}{\|a-c\|^2} + \dfrac{\kappa}{2}\dfrac{\langle z-c,b-c\rangle^2}{\|b-c\|^2}, & \text{if } p(z)\geq 0 \text{ and } q(z)\geq 0,\end{cases}$$

where $p(z) = \langle a-c, z-c\rangle$ and $q(z) = \langle b-c, z-c\rangle$.

From [14, Lemma 8], we know that if F is the 1-field associated to f, then F is a MLE of U on $\mathbb{R}^2$. Moreover, from [14, Lemma 9] we have

$$A_{x,y}(F) = 0, \tag{13}$$

if

$$x,y \in \{z \in \mathbb{R}^2 : p(z) \geq 0 \text{ and } q(z) \leq 0\},$$

or

$$x,y \in \{z \in \mathbb{R}^2 : p(z) \leq 0 \text{ and } q(z) \geq 0\},$$

or

$$x,y \in \{z \in \mathbb{R}^2 : p(z) \leq 0 \text{ and } q(z) \leq 0\},$$

or

$$x,y \in \{z \in \mathbb{R}^2 : p(z) \geq 0 \text{ and } q(z) \geq 0\}.$$

We define

$$\begin{cases} w_a = h - \dfrac{1}{\beta^2} v \\ w_b = -h - \dfrac{1}{\beta^2} v \end{cases}$$

where $h = \frac{b-a}{2}$, $v = \frac{D_a u - D_b u}{2\kappa}$ and $\beta = \|v\| \in (0,1)$.

Since $\|h\| = 1$, $\beta = \|v\|$, $\langle h, v \rangle = 0$, $c-a = h+v$ and $c-b = -h+v$, we have

$$\langle c-a, w_a \rangle = 0 \text{ and } \langle c-b, w_b \rangle = 0.$$

There exists $\alpha_0 \in (0,+\infty)$ and α_0 is small such that $x_a = c + \alpha_0 w_b$, and $x_b = c + \alpha_0 w_a$ are in the interior of convex hull of $\{a,b,c\}$. We define

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_a &= \{x \in \mathbb{R}^2 : x = c + \alpha w_b, \alpha \geq \alpha_0\}, \\ \Delta_b &= \{x \in \mathbb{R}^2 : x = c + \alpha w_a, \alpha \geq \alpha_0\}, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\omega_1 = \Delta_a \cup \{a\},\ \omega_2 = \Delta_a \cup \Delta_b,\ \omega_3 = \Delta_b \cup \{b\}.$$

*Step 1: In this step, we will prove that there exist a constant $k \in (0,1)$ depending on β and α_0



Figure 1:

such that

$$\max_{i=1,2,3} \Gamma^1(F;\omega_i) \leq k\kappa.$$

Since $\|h\| = 1,\ \|v\| = \beta \in (0,1)$, $c-a = h+v,\ c-b = -h+v,\ \langle h,v\rangle = 0,\ \langle c-a, w_a\rangle = 0$ and $\langle c-b, w_b\rangle = 0$, we have
*If $x, x' \in \Delta_a$, then

$$\frac{1}{\kappa}\mathrm{Lip}(\nabla f; x, x') = \frac{\|\langle x-x', a-c\rangle\|}{\|x-x'\|\|a-c\|} = 1 - \frac{(\beta-1)^2}{1+\beta^2}. \tag{14}$$

*If $x, x' \in \Delta_b$, then

$$\frac{1}{\kappa}\mathrm{Lip}(\nabla f; x, x') = \frac{\|\langle x-x', b-c\rangle\|}{\|x-x'\|\|b-c\|} = 1 - \frac{(\beta-1)^2}{1+\beta^2}. \tag{15}$$

*If $x \in \Delta_a$, $x' \in \Delta_b$, then

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{\kappa}\mathrm{Lip}(\nabla f; x, x') &= \left\| \frac{-\langle x-x', c-a\rangle (c-a)}{\|x-x'\|\|c-a\|^2} + \frac{\langle x-x', c-b\rangle (c-b)}{\|x-x'\|\|c-b\|^2} \right\| \\ &= 1 - \frac{(\beta-1)^2}{1+\beta^2}. \end{aligned} \tag{16}$$

*If $x = c + \alpha w_b \in \Delta_a$, then

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{\kappa}\mathrm{Lip}(\nabla f; x, a) &= \frac{\|\langle x-a, a-c\rangle\|}{\|x-a\|\|a-c\|} \\ &= 1 - \frac{\alpha^2(\beta^2-1)^2}{(1+\beta^2)(\beta^2(1-\alpha)^2 + (\beta^2-\alpha)^2)}. \end{aligned} \tag{17}$$

*If $x = c + \alpha w_a \in \Delta_b$, then

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{\kappa}\mathrm{Lip}(\nabla f; x, b) &= \frac{\|\langle x-b, b-c\rangle\|}{\|x-b\|\|b-c\|} \\ &= 1 - \frac{\alpha^2(\beta^2-1)^2}{(1+\beta^2)(\beta^2(1-\alpha)^2 + (\beta^2-\alpha)^2)}. \end{aligned} \tag{18}$$

From (13), (14),(15),(16),(17),(18) and Proposition 4, we have

$$\max_{i=1,2,3} \Gamma^1(F; \omega_i) \le k\kappa, \tag{19}$$

where $k \in (0,1)$ is a constant depending on β and α_0.

*Step 2: We will construct Ω open convex set, and a 1-field $G \in \mathscr{F}^1(\Omega)$ such that

$$\mathrm{Lip}(\nabla g; \Omega) < \Gamma^1(G; \Omega).$$

Using the notation $R_{x,y}$ to denote the ray starting x and passing through another point y. Let A_1 be the convex hull of $\Delta_a \cup \{R_{x_a,a}\}$, A_2 be the convex hull of $\Delta_a \cup \Delta_b$ and A_3 be the convex hull of $\Delta_b \cup \{R_{x_b,b}\}$. Let Ω be the interior of $A_1 \cup A_2 \cup A_3$. Then Ω is open and convex.

Let G_i be MLE of $F|_{\omega_i}$, for $i \in \{1,2,3\}$. We define a 1-field G on $\overline{\Omega}$ by $G(x) = G_i(x)$ if $x \in A_i$ for $i \in \{1,2,3\}$.
We will prove that $G \in \mathscr{F}^1(\Omega)$ and $\mathrm{Lip}(\nabla g; \Omega) < \Gamma^1(G; \Omega)$.



Figure 2:

For all $x \in \Omega$, there exists $r > 0$ such that $B(x,r) \subset \Omega$. For all $h \in B(x,r)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |g_{x+h} - g_x - \langle D_x g; h\rangle| &= |G(x+h)(x+h) - G(x)(x+h)|, \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} \max_{i=1,2,3} \Gamma^1(G_i; A_i)\|h\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Hence $g \in \mathscr{C}^1(\Omega, \mathbb{R})$.

Thus, by applying Lemma 10 and Proposition 4 we have

$$\mathrm{Lip}(\nabla g; \Omega) \leq \max_{i=1,2,3} \mathrm{Lip}(\nabla g; A_i) \leq \max_{i=1,2,3} \Gamma^1(F; A_i) \leq k\kappa. \tag{20}$$

Therefore, by applying Corollary 9 we have $G \in \mathscr{F}^1(\Omega)$.

On the other hand, we have

$$\Gamma^1(G;\Omega) = \Gamma^1(G;\overline{\Omega}) \geq \Gamma^1(G;a,b) = \kappa. \tag{21}$$

From (20) and (21). We have

$$\mathrm{Lip}(\nabla g; \Omega) \leq k\kappa \leq k\Gamma^1(G;\Omega) < \Gamma^1(G;\Omega).$$

□

Remark 12. With the same notation as the proof of Proposition 11. There exist an open strictly convex Ω' subset of Ω such that $a, b \in \overline{\Omega'}$, and we have

$$\mathrm{Lip}(\nabla g; \Omega') \leq \mathrm{Lip}(\nabla g; \Omega) \leq k\kappa \leq k\Gamma^1(G;\Omega') < \Gamma^1(G;\Omega').$$

Thus in Proposition 11 we can replace Ω *open convex* by Ω *open strictly convex*.

Moreover, when we let x_a, x_b such that $\mathrm{dist}(x_a, [a,b])$ and $\mathrm{dist}(x_b, [a,b])$ converge to 0. Then the smallest constant k that is chosen satisfying (19) converges to $\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}$. An interesting question is that what is the optimal constant c that is the largest constant and satisfies $\mathrm{Lip}(\nabla g, \Omega) \geq c\Gamma^1(F, \Omega)$ for all Ω open convex set and for all $F \in \mathscr{F}^1(\Omega)$? We do not exact value of the optimal constant c, but from above consideration and Proposition 8, we obtain $c \in [\frac{1}{2}, \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}]$.

Theorem 13. *Let Ω be an open set in $\mathbb{R}^n$ and let $F \in \mathscr{F}^1(\overline{\Omega})$. We have*

$$\Gamma^1(F;\Omega) = \max\left\{\mathrm{Lip}(Df;\Omega), \Gamma^1(F;\partial\Omega)\right\}.$$

Proof. From [12, Proposition 2.10] we know that $\Gamma^1(F;\Omega) = \Gamma^1(F;\overline{\Omega})$. Thus

$$\Gamma^1(F;\Omega) \geq \Gamma^1(F;\partial\Omega). \tag{22}$$

Furthermore, we know that $\Gamma^1(F;\Omega) \geq \mathrm{Lip}(Df;\Omega)$. Therefore,

$$\Gamma^1(F;\Omega) \geq \max\left\{\mathrm{Lip}(Df;\Omega), \Gamma^1(F;\partial\Omega)\right\}.$$

Conversely, let us turn to the proof of the opposite inequality:

$$\Gamma^1(F;\Omega) \leq \max\left\{\mathrm{Lip}(Df;\Omega), \Gamma^1(F;\partial\Omega)\right\}. \tag{23}$$

Let $F_{|\partial\Omega}$ be the restriction of F to $\partial\Omega$ and let G be a MLE of $F_{|\partial\Omega}$ on $\mathbb{R}^n\backslash\Omega$. We have $G = F$ on $\partial\Omega$ and

$$\Gamma^1(G;\mathbb{R}^n\backslash\Omega) = \Gamma^1(F;\partial\Omega). \tag{24}$$

We define

$$H(x) \triangleq \begin{cases} F(x), \text{ if } x \in \Omega, \\ G(x), \text{ if } x \in \mathbb{R}^n\backslash\Omega. \end{cases}$$

*Step 1: We will prove that $H \in \mathscr{F}^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$. Indeed, let $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n$ $(x \neq y)$. We have three cases:
Case 1: If $x, y \in \Omega$ $(x \neq y)$ then $\Gamma^1(H;x,y) = \Gamma^1(F;x,y) \leq \Gamma^1(F;\Omega)$.
Case 2: If $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n\backslash\Omega$ $(x \neq y)$ then since (22) and (24) we have

$$\Gamma^1(H;x,y) = \Gamma^1(G;x,y) \leq \Gamma^1(G,\mathbb{R}^n\backslash\Omega) = \Gamma^1(F;\partial\Omega) \leq \Gamma^1(F,\Omega).$$

Case 3: If $x \in \Omega$ and $y \in \mathbb{R}^n\backslash\Omega$. Let $H_{|\{x,y\}}$ be the restriction of H to $\mathrm{dom}(H_{|\{x,y\}}) = \{x,y\}$. From [14, Proposition 2], there exists $c \in B_{1/2}(x,y)$ such that:

$$\Gamma^1(H;x,y) \leq \max\{\Gamma^1(H;x,z), \Gamma^1(H;z,y)\}, \text{ for all } z \in [x,c] \cup [y,c].$$

Let $z \in ([x,c] \cup [y,c]) \cap \partial\Omega$, we obtain

$$\Gamma^1(H;x,y) \leq \max\{\Gamma^1(H;x,z), \Gamma^1(H;z,y)\}.$$

Moreover, since $x, z \in \overline{\Omega}$ we get

$$\Gamma^1(H;x,z) \;=\; \Gamma^1(F;x,z) \leq \Gamma^1(F;\overline{\Omega}) = \Gamma^1(F;\Omega),$$

and since $y, z \in \mathbb{R}^n\backslash\Omega$ we get

$$\Gamma^1(H;z,y) \;=\; \Gamma^1(G;z,y) \leq \Gamma^1(G;\mathbb{R}^n\backslash\Omega) = \Gamma^1(F;\partial\Omega) \leq \Gamma^1(F;\Omega).$$

Therefore $\Gamma^1(H;x,y) \leq \Gamma^1(F;\Omega)$.
Combining these three cases we have $\Gamma^1(H;\mathbb{R}^n) \leq \Gamma^1(F;\Omega) < +\infty$. This implies that $H \in \mathscr{F}^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$.

*Step 2: We will prove (23). Since $H \in \mathscr{F}^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$, we have $\Gamma^1(H;\mathbb{R}^n) = \mathrm{Lip}(\nabla h;\mathbb{R}^n)$ by ([12, Proposition 2.4]). Thus

$$\Gamma^1(F;\Omega) = \Gamma^1(H;\Omega) \leq \Gamma^1(H;\mathbb{R}^n) = \mathrm{Lip}(\nabla h;\mathbb{R}^n).$$

On the other hand, $\mathrm{Lip}(Df;\Omega) = \mathrm{Lip}(\nabla h;\Omega)$ and

$$\Gamma^1(F;\partial\Omega) = \Gamma^1(G;\mathbb{R}^n\backslash\Omega) = \Gamma^1(H;\mathbb{R}^n\backslash\Omega) \geq \mathrm{Lip}(\nabla h;\mathbb{R}^n\backslash\Omega).$$

Therefore, to prove (23), it suffices to show that

$$\mathrm{Lip}(\nabla h;\mathbb{R}^n) \leq \max\left\{\mathrm{Lip}(\nabla h;\Omega), \mathrm{Lip}(\nabla h;\mathbb{R}^n\backslash\Omega)\right\}.$$

The final inequality is true from Lemma 10. □

4 Sup-Inf Explicit Formulas for Minimal Lipschitz Extensions for 1-Fields on $\mathbb{R}^n$

In this section let Ω be a nonempty subset of $\mathbb{R}^n$. Fix $F \in \mathscr{F}^1(\Omega)$ and define $\kappa \triangleq \Gamma^1(F;\Omega)$. We will give two explicit formulas for extremal extension problem of F on $\mathbb{R}^n$.

Definition 14. For any $a,b \in \Omega$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, we define

$$\begin{aligned}
v_{a,b} &\triangleq \frac{1}{2}(D_a f + D_b f) + \frac{\kappa}{2}(b-a),\\
\alpha_{a,b} &\triangleq 2\kappa(f_a - f_b) + \kappa\langle D_a f + D_b f, b-a\rangle - \frac{1}{2}\|D_a f - D_b f\|^2 + \frac{\kappa^2}{2}\|a-b\|^2\\
&\triangleq (\kappa A_{a,b}(F) - \frac{B_{a,b}(F)^2}{2} + \frac{\kappa^2}{2})\|a-b\|^2,\\
\beta_{a,b}(x) &\triangleq \left\|\frac{1}{2}(D_a f - D_b f) + \frac{\kappa}{2}(2x-a-b)\right\|^2,
\end{aligned}$$

We know (see [[12], Theorem 2.6]) that $\alpha_{a,b} \geq 0$ thus we can define

$$\begin{aligned}
r_{a,b}(x) &\triangleq \sqrt{\alpha_{a,b} + \beta_{a,b}(x)},\\
\Lambda_x &\triangleq \left\{v \in \mathbb{R}^n : \|v - v_{a,b}\| \leq r_{a,b}(x), \forall a,b \in \Omega\right\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Definition 15. For any $a \in \Omega$, $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $v \in \Lambda_x$ we define

$$\begin{aligned}
\Psi^+(F,x,a,v) &\triangleq f_a + \frac{1}{2}\langle D_a f + v, x-a\rangle + \frac{\kappa}{4}\|a-x\|^2 - \frac{1}{4\kappa}\|D_a f - v\|^2,\\
\Psi^-(F,x,a,v) &\triangleq f_a + \frac{1}{2}\langle D_a f + v, x-a\rangle - \frac{\kappa}{4}\|a-x\|^2 + \frac{1}{4\kappa}\|D_a f - v\|^2,\\
u^+(x) &\triangleq \sup_{v\in\Lambda_x}\inf_{a\in\Omega}\Psi^+(F,x,a,v),
\end{aligned}$$

An important part of the proof of the [Theorem 2.6, [12]] shows that Λ_x is nonempty for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Since Λ_x is nonempty and compact, and the map $v \longmapsto \Psi^+(F,x,a,v)$ is continuous, the map u^+ is well defined.

Proposition 16. *Fix $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Then there exists a unique element $v_x^+ \in \Lambda_x$ such that*

$$u^+(x) = \inf_{a\in\Omega} \Psi^+(F,x,a,v_x^+).$$

Proof. Since Λ_x is compact and nonempty, there exists $v_x^+ \in \Lambda_x$ such that

$$u^+(x) = \inf_{a\in\Omega} \Psi^+(F,x,a,v_x^+).$$

We will prove that v_x^+ is uniquely determined. Indeed, for any $a \in \Omega$ we define

$$g_a(v) = \Psi^+(F,x,a,v), \text{ for } v \in \Lambda_x.$$

Then for any $t \in (0,1)$ and $(v_1,v_2) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n$

$$g_a(tv_1+(1-t)v_2) = tg_a(v_1)+(1-t)g_a(v_2)+\frac{1}{4\kappa}t(1-t)\|v_1-v_2\|^2.$$

Thus g_a is strictly concave. If we define $g(v) = \inf_{a\in\Omega} g_a(v)$ for $v \in \Lambda_x$ then for any $t \in (0,1)$ and $(v_1,v_2) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n$

$$g(tv_1+(1-t)v_2) \geq tg(v_1)+(1-t)g(v_2)+\frac{1}{4\kappa}t(1-t)\|v_1-v_2\|^2.$$

Thus g is also strictly concave.
To prove v_x^+ is uniquely determined, we need to prove that if $g(v) = g(v_x^+)$ then $v = v_x^+$, where $v \in \Lambda_x$. Assume by contradiction there exists $v \in \Lambda_x$ such that $v \neq v_x^+$ and $g(v) = g(v_x^+)$. Since Λ_x is a convex set we have $tv+(1-t)v_x^+ \in \Lambda_x$ for $t \in (0,1)$. Thus $g(tv+(1-t)v_x^+) > tg(v)+(1-t)g(v_x^+) = g(v_x^+)$, which is a contradiction to $g(v_x^+) = \sup_{v\in\Lambda_x} g(v)$. □

The previous proposition allows to define the following one-field

Definition 17.

$$U^+ : x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mapsto U^+(x)(a) \triangleq u^+(x) + \langle D_x u^+; a-x\rangle, a \in \mathbb{R}^n. \tag{25}$$

with

$$u^+(x) \triangleq \max_{v\in\Lambda_x} \inf_{a\in\Omega} \Psi^+(F,x,a,v), \quad D_x u^+ \triangleq \arg\max_{v\in\Lambda_x} \inf_{a\in\Omega} \Psi^+(F,x,a,v).$$

Using the proof of [Theorem 2.6, [12]], we can easily show the following proposition

Proposition 18. *Let $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and define $\Omega_1 = \Omega \cup \{x_0\}$. Let U an extension of F on Ω_1. Then the following conditions are equivalent*
(i) U is a MLE of F on Ω_1.
(ii)

$$\sup_{a\in\Omega} \Psi^-(F,x,a,D_x u) \leq u(x) \leq \inf_{a\in\Omega} \Psi^+(F,x,a,D_x u), \ \ \forall x \in \Omega_1.$$

Furthermore

$$\left[\sup_{a\in\Omega} \Psi^-(F,x,a,D_x u) \leq \inf_{a\in\Omega} \Psi^+(F,x,a,D_x u)\right] \Leftrightarrow [D_x u \in \Lambda_x], \ \ \forall x \in \Omega_1.$$

Corollary 19. *Let Ω_1 be a subset of $\mathbb{R}^n$ such that $\Omega \subset \Omega_1$. Let G be a MLE of F on Ω_1. For all $x \in \Omega_1$, we have $D_x g \in \Lambda_x$ and*

$$\sup_{a\in\Omega} \Psi^-(F,x,a,D_x g) \leq g(x) \leq \inf_{a\in\Omega} \Psi^+(F,x,a,D_x g) \leq u^+(x), \ \ \forall x \in \Omega_1.$$

Proof. The proof is immediate from Proposition 18. □

Theorem 20. *The 1-field U^+ is the unique over extremal extension of F.*

Proof. Applying Theorem 47, there exists W^+ an over extremal extension of F on $\mathbb{R}^n$. Let w^+ be the canonical associates to W^+. We will prove $U^+ = W^+$ on $\mathbb{R}^n$.

*Step 1: Let $x \in \Omega$. Since W^+ is an extension of F we have $W^+(x) = F(x)$. Noting that Λ_x has a unique element to be $D_x f$ (since $x \in \Omega$ and from the definition of Λ_x). So that $D_x u^+ = D_x f$ and

$$u^+(x) \ = \ \inf_{a\in\Omega} \Psi^+(F,x,a,D_x f).$$

From Proposition 18 we have

$$\Psi^+(F,x,a,D_x f) \geq f(x), \text{ for any } a \in \Omega.$$

Furthermore, when $a = x$ we have $\Psi^+(F,x,x,D_x f) = f(x)$. Therefore $u^+(x) = f(x)$.
Conclusion for all $x \in \Omega$, $U^+(x) = W^+(x)$.

*Step 2: Let $x \in \mathbb{R}^n \backslash \Omega$. We first prove that $u^+(x) \geq w^+(x)$. Since W^+ is a MLE of F on $\mathbb{R}^n$, we can apply Proposition 18 to obtain $D_x w \in \Lambda_x$ and

$$w^+(x) \leq \inf_{a\in\Omega} \Psi^+(F,x,a,D_x w) \leq u^+(x).$$

Conversely, we will prove that $u^+(x) \leq w^+(x)$. Applying Proposition 16, $D_x u^+$ is the unique element in Λ_x such that $u^+(x) = \inf_{a\in\Omega} \Psi^+(F,x,a,D_x u^+)$.

We define the 1-field G of domain $\Omega \cup \{x\}$ as

$$G(y) \triangleq F(y), \ y \in \Omega \text{ and } G(x) \triangleq U^+(x)$$

Since $D_x g = D_x u^+ \in \Lambda_x$, we can apply Proposition 18 to have

$$g(x) = u^+(x) = \inf_{a\in\Omega} \Psi^+(F,x,a,D_x g) \geq \sup_{a\in\Omega} \Psi^-(F,x,a,D_x g). \tag{26}$$

From (26) and Proposition 18, we have G to be a MLE of F on $\Omega \cup \{x\}$.

By applying [Theorem 2.6, [12]] there exists $\tilde{G}$ to be a MLE of G on $\mathbb{R}^n$.

Since $\text{dom}(F) \subset \text{dom}(G)$, $\tilde{G}$ is also a MLE of F on $\mathbb{R}^n$. Since W^+ is over extremal extension of F on $\mathbb{R}^n$, we have $\tilde{g}(x) \leq w^+(x)$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Thus $u^+(x) = g(x) = \tilde{g}(x) \leq w^+(x)$. Combining this with $w^+(x) \leq u^+(x)$ we have $u^+(x) = w^+(x)$.

Finally, using Proposition 18 and the previous equality we have

$$u^+(x) = w^+(x) \leq \inf_{a\in\Omega} \Psi^+(F,x,a,D_x w^+) \leq u^+(x) = \inf_{a\in\Omega} \Psi^+(F,x,a,D_x u^+).$$

Thus we obtain the following equality

$$\inf_{a\in\Omega}\Psi^+(F,x,a,D_xw^+)=\inf_{a\in\Omega}\Psi^+(F,x,a,D_xu^+).$$

Therefore $D_xw^+=D_xu^+$ by Proposition 16.

Conclusion for all $x\in\mathbb{R}^n$, $U^+(x)=W^+(x)$.

The uniqueness of an over extremal extension of F arises because W^+ be to any over extremal extension of F.

□

Thanks to result of Theorem 47. Indeed, this result allows to define an under extremal extension of F. That is

Definition 21. For any $a\in\Omega$, $x\in\mathbb{R}^n$ and $v\in\Lambda_x$ we define

$$u^-(x) \triangleq \inf_{v\in\Lambda_x}\sup_{a\in\Omega}\Psi^-(F,x,a,v).$$

Using the strict convexity of the map $v\longmapsto\Psi^-(F,x,a,v)$ and the compacity of Λ_x as in the proof of proposition 16 (replacing concavity by convexity) we obtain the following proposition

Proposition 22. *Let $x\in\mathbb{R}^n$. Then there exists a unique element $v_x^-\in\Lambda_x$ such that $u^-(x)=\sup_{a\in\Omega}\Psi^-(F,x,a,v_x^-)$.*

This allows us to define the following 1-field

Definition 23.

$$U^-:x\in\mathbb{R}^n\mapsto U^-(x)(a)\triangleq u^-(x)+\langle D_xu^-;a-x\rangle,\ a\in\mathbb{R}^n. \tag{27}$$

with

$$u^-(x)\triangleq\min_{v\in\Lambda_x}\sup_{a\in\Omega}\Psi^-(F,x,a,v),\quad D_xu^-\triangleq\arg\min_{v\in\Lambda_x}\sup_{a\in\Omega}\Psi^-(F,x,a,v).$$

Theorem 24. *The 1-field U^- is the unique under extremal extension of F.*

Proof. Using theorem 47 and the Proposition (22) the proof using similar arguments as in the proof of theorem 20 □

In conclusion we have the following corollary

Corollary 25. *For all minimal Lischitz extension G of F we have*

$$u^-(x)\le g(x)\le u^+(x),\ \forall x\in\mathbb{R}^n.$$

5 Sup-Inf Explicit Formulas for Minimal Lipschitz Extensions for function from $\mathbb{R}^m$ to $\mathbb{R}^n$

Now, we propose to use the previous results to produce formulas comparable to those Bauschke and Wang have found see [6].

Let us define first $\mathscr{Q}_0$ as the problem of the minimum extension for Lipschitzian functions second $\mathscr{Q}_1$ as the problem of the minimum extension for 1-fields. Curiously, we will show that the problem $\mathscr{Q}_0$ is a sub-problem of the problem $\mathscr{Q}_1$. As a consequence, we obtain two explicit formulas that solve the problem $\mathscr{Q}_0$.

More specifically, fix $n,m \in \mathbb{N}^*$ and $\omega \subset \mathbb{R}^m$. Let u be a function from ω maps to $\mathbb{R}^n$. Suppose $\mathrm{Lip}(u;\omega) < +\infty$ and define $l \triangleq \mathrm{Lip}(u;\omega)$.

Let us define

$$\Omega \triangleq \{(x,0) \in \mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R}^n : x \in \omega\}$$

A current element of $\mathbb{R}^{m+n}$ will denote by $x := (x^{(m)}, x^{(n)}) \in \mathbb{R}^{m+n}$, with $x^{(m)} \in \mathbb{R}^m$ and $x^{(n)} \in \mathbb{R}^n$.

Now we will define a 1-field associated with u denote by F from $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^{n+m}$ maps to $\mathscr{P}^1(\mathbb{R}^{n+m}, \mathbb{R})$ as the following

$$f(x,0) \triangleq 0, \text{ and } D_{(x,0)}f \triangleq (0, u(x)), \text{ for all } x \in \omega. \tag{28}$$

Let $a,b \in \omega$, with $a \neq b$. Observing that

$$f(a,0) = f(b,0) = 0, \text{ and } \langle D_{(a,0)}f + D_{(b,0)}f, (b-a,0)\rangle = 0,$$

and applying Proposition 4 we have

$$\Gamma^1(F,(a,0),(b,0)) = \frac{\|D_{(a,0)}f - D_{(b,0)}f\|}{\|b-a\|}.$$

Therefore

$$\Gamma^1(F,\Omega) = \mathrm{Lip}(u,\omega). \tag{29}$$

Let G be an minimal Lipschitz extension of F. We have $G \in \mathscr{F}^1(\mathbb{R}^{m+n})$ and

$$\Gamma^1(F,\Omega) = \Gamma^1(G,\mathbb{R}^{m+n}). \tag{30}$$

Using [12, Proposition 2.4] we have

$$\Gamma^1(G;\mathbb{R}^{m+n}) = \mathrm{Lip}(Dg;\mathbb{R}^{m+n}). \tag{31}$$

Now we define the map $\tilde{u}$ from $\mathbb{R}^m$ to $\mathbb{R}^n$ as following

$$\tilde{u}(x) \triangleq (D_{(x,0)}g)^{(n)},\ x \in \mathbb{R}^m. \tag{32}$$

We will show that $\tilde{u}$ is a minimal Lipschitz extension of u.

First, let $x \in \omega$. Since G is an extension of F and by construction of F we have

$$\tilde{u}(x) = (D_{(x,0)}g)^{(n)} = u(x).$$

Thus $\tilde{u}$ is an extension of u.
Second, let $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^m$ with $x \neq y$. Using (29), (30) and (31) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{Lip}(\tilde{u};x,y) &= \frac{\|(D_{(x,0)}g)^{(n)}-(D_{(y,0)}g)^{(n)}\|}{\|x-y\|}, \\ &\leq \frac{\|D_{(x,0)}g-D_{(y,0)}g\|}{\|x-y\|}, \\ &\leq \Gamma^1(G;\mathbb{R}^{m+n}), \\ &= \mathrm{Lip}(u,\omega). \end{aligned} \tag{33}$$

Conclusion, $\tilde{u}$ is an minimal Lipchitz extension of u. Therefore, we obtain another proof of Kirsbraun's theorem (see [18]).

Theorem 26. *Let u be a function from $\omega \subset \mathbb{R}^m$ to $\mathbb{R}^n$. Suppose u Lipschitzian. Let F be the 1-field defined by the formula (28) . Let G be any minimal Lipschitz extension of F. Then the extension $\tilde{u}$ define by the formula (32) is a minimal Lipschitz extension of u.*

By replacing G in Theorem 26, by U^- and U^+, we have two formulas which resolve the problem $\mathscr{Q}_0$. Now describe these formulas which resolve the problem $\mathscr{Q}_0$.

Let $a, b \in \omega$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}^m$ we define

$$\begin{aligned} v_{a,b} &\triangleq \left(\frac{l}{2}(b-a), \frac{1}{2}(u(a)+u(b))\right), \\ \alpha_{a,b} &\triangleq -\frac{1}{2}\|u(a)-u(b)\|^2 + \frac{l^2}{2}\|a-b\|, \\ \beta_{a,b}(z) &\triangleq \|lx-a-b\|^2 + \|\frac{1}{2}(u(a)-u(b))\|^2, \\ r_{a,b}(x) &\triangleq \sqrt{\alpha_{a,b}+\beta_{a,b}(x)}, \\ \Lambda_x &\triangleq \{v \in \mathbb{R}^{m+n} : \|v-v_{a,b}\| \leq r_{a,b}(x), \forall a,b \in \omega\}. \end{aligned}$$

For $v \in \mathbb{R}^{m+n}$, we define

$$\Phi^+(u,x,a,v) \triangleq \frac{1}{2}\langle v^{(m)}, x-a\rangle + \frac{l}{4}\|a-x\|^2 - \frac{1}{4l}(\|v^{(m)}\|^2 + \|u(a)-v^{(n)}\|^2), \tag{34}$$

$$\Phi^-(u,x,a,v) \triangleq \frac{1}{2}\langle v^{(m)}, x-a\rangle - \frac{l}{4}\|a-x\|^2 + \frac{1}{4l}(\|v^{(m)}\|^2 + \|u(a)-v^{(n)}\|^2). \tag{35}$$

Now using the previous notation, we define two maps from $\mathbb{R}^m$ to $\mathbb{R}^n$ as following

$$k^+(x) \triangleq (\arg\max_{v\in\Lambda_x} \inf_{a\in\omega} \Phi^+(u,x,a,v))^{(n)},\ x \in \mathbb{R}^m, \tag{36}$$

and

$$k^-(x) \triangleq (\arg\min_{v\in\Lambda_x} \sup_{a\in\omega} \Phi^-(u,x,a,v))^{(n)},\ x \in \mathbb{R}^m. \tag{37}$$

Theorem 27. *The maps k^+ and k^- define by the formulas (36) and (37) are minimal Lipschitz extensions of u.*

Commment 1. If ω is finite using the previous transformation $u \longrightarrow F$ the Wells explicite construction of u^+ or u^- allows to compute u^+ and u^-.

We know that the proof of Kirszbraun-Valentine's theorem and the proof of [Theorem 2.6, [12]] use Zorn's lemma. Noticing that, like [6], the proof showing that Λ_x is not empty and the proof of Wells' Theorem 38 do not use Zorn's lemma.

6 Absolutely Minimal Lipschitz Extensions

6.1 Finite domain

Let $A = \{p_1, ..., p_m\}$ be a finite subset of $\mathbb{R}^n$ ($n \geq 2$) and let $F \in \mathscr{F}^1(A)$. Fix $\kappa = \Gamma^1(F;A)$. In this section, we prove that the functions $W^+(F,A,\kappa)$ and $W^-(F,A,\kappa)$ defined in Appendix 7.1 and 7.2 are AMLEs of F on $\mathbb{R}^n$.

Theorem 28. *$W^+(F,A,\kappa)$ and $W^-(F,A,\kappa)$ are AMLEs of F on $\mathbb{R}^n$.*

Proof. For brevity let us denote $W^+(F,A,\kappa)$ by W^+. We prove that W^+ is an AMLE of F on $\mathbb{R}^n$. Since Corollary 39, we have W^+ to be an MLE of F on $\mathbb{R}^n$.
Let V be a bounded open satisfying $\bar{V} \subset \mathbb{R}^n \setminus A$. We need to prove that $\Gamma^1(W^+;V) = \Gamma^1(W^+;\partial V)$. Indeed, the inequality $\Gamma^1(W^+;V) \geq \Gamma^1(W^+;\partial V)$ is clearly true, so that we only need to prove that $\Gamma^1(W^+;\partial V) \geq \Gamma^1(W^+;V)$. Because $\kappa = \Gamma^1(W^+;\mathbb{R}^n) \geq \Gamma^1(W^+;V)$ and $\Gamma^1(W^+;\partial V) \geq \mathrm{Lip}(\nabla w^+;\partial V)$ (from Proposition 4), it is enough to show that $\mathrm{Lip}(\nabla w^+, \partial V) \geq \kappa$.
Applying Proposition 35 we have $\bigcup_{S \in K^+} T_S^+ = \mathbb{R}^n$ (K^+ and T_S^+ are defined in Appendix 7.1). Since A has finite elements, we have K^+ has finite elements. On the other hand, ∂V has infinite elements. Therefore there exist $S \in K^+$ and $x_0, y_0 \in \partial V$ such that $x_0, y_0 \in T_S^+$. Applying [28, Lemma 21] we have

$$\|\nabla w^+(x_0) - \nabla w^+(y_0)\| = \kappa \|x_0 - y_0\|.$$

Thus

$$\mathrm{Lip}(\nabla w^+, \partial V) \geq \frac{\|\nabla w^+(x_0) - \nabla w^+(y_0)\|}{\|x_0 - y_0\|} = \kappa.$$

Therefore W^+ is an AMLE of F on $\mathbb{R}^n$.
The proof for W^- is similar. □

Corollary 29. *There exist infinity solutions AMLE of F on $\mathbb{R}^n$.*

Proof. From the definition of $W^+(F,A,\kappa)$ and $W^-(F,A,\kappa)$, we have $W^+(F,A,\kappa) \neq W^-(F,A,\kappa)$.
Let $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus A$ such that $W^+(F,A,\kappa)(x_0) \neq W^-(F,A,\kappa)(x_0)$. Noting that

$$W_\tau = \tau W^+(F,A,\kappa) + (1-\tau) W^-(F,A,\kappa)$$

is MLE of F on $\mathbb{R}^n$, for any $\tau \in [0,1]$.
Thus there exist infinity solution MLE of F on $A \cup \{x_0\}$.
Let G be a MLE of F on $A \cup \{x_0\}$. By the same argument as the proof of Theorem 28, we have $W^+(G, A \cup \{x_0\}, \kappa)$ is the AMLE of F on $\mathbb{R}^n$.
Therefore, we have infinity solutions AMLE of F on $\mathbb{R}^n$. □

6.2 Infinite domain

Let Ω be a nonempty subset of $\mathbb{R}^n$ and let $F \in \mathscr{F}^1(\Omega)$. Fix $\kappa = \Gamma^1(F;\Omega)$. From Section 6.1, we know that if Ω is a finite set then the functions $W^+(F,\Omega,\kappa)$ and $W^-(F,\Omega,\kappa)$ defined in Appendix 7.1 and 7.2 are AMLEs of F on $\mathbb{R}^n$ ($n \geq 2$). So that, we hope that in general case when Ω is an infinite set, the functions $W^+(F,\Omega)$ and $W^-(F,\Omega)$ defined in Appendix 7.3 are also AMLEs of F on $\mathbb{R}^n$. Unfortunately, this is not true. We give an example that Ω is an infinite set and neither $W^+(F,\Omega)$ nor $W^-(F,\Omega)$ is AMLE of F on $\mathbb{R}^n$.

Proposition 30. *We consider in* $\mathbb{R}^2$. *Let* $\Omega_1 = \partial B(0;1)$ *and* $\Omega_2 = \partial B(0;2)$. *Let* $\Omega = \Omega_1 \cup \Omega_2$. *Let* $F \in \mathscr{F}^1(\Omega)$ *such that* $f_x = 0$ *for all* x *in* Ω_1, $f_x = 1$ *for all* x *in* Ω_2, *and* $D_x f = 0$ *for all* x *in* Ω. *Then neither* $W^+(F,\Omega)$ *nor* $W^-(F,\Omega)$ *is AMLE of* F *on* $\mathbb{R}^2$.

Proof. For brevity let us denote $W^+(F,\Omega)$ by W^+. We will prove that W^+ is not an AMLE of F on $\mathbb{R}^n$. To do this, we need to find an open set $V \subset\subset \mathbb{R}^2/\Omega$ such that $\Gamma^1(W^+;V) \neq \Gamma^1(W^+;\partial V)$. Let $V = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^2 : \|x\| < 3/4\} \subset\subset \mathbb{R}^2/\Omega$, we will prove $\Gamma^1(W^+;V) \neq \Gamma^1(W^+;\partial V)$.



Figure 3:

Applying Proposition 4 we have $\kappa = \Gamma^1(F;\Omega) = 4$.
Let $\mathscr{A}$ be the set of all finite sets A_N, where $A_N = \{p_1,...,p_N\} \cup \{q_1,...,q_N\}$ satisfies $\{p_1,p_2,...p_N\} \subset \Omega_1$, $\{q_1,q_2,...,q_N\} \subset \Omega_2$ and $p_i \in [0,q_i]$ for all $i \in 1,...,N$.
Let $A_N \in \mathscr{A}$. For brevity let us denote the functions $W^+(F,A_N,\kappa)$ defined in Appendix 7.1 by $W^+_{A_N}$.
Applying Proposition 4 we have $\kappa_N = \Gamma^1(W^+_{A_N};A_N) = 4 = \kappa$.
We have $[\frac{0+p_i}{2}, \frac{p_i+q_i}{2}] \subset T^+_{p_i}$, for all $i \in \{1,...,N\}$, where $T^+_{p_i}$ is defined in Appendix 7.1 with the corresponding definition for the finite set $A = A_N$. From the definition of $w^+_{A_N}$, we have:

$$w^+_{A_N}(x) = \frac{\kappa}{2}(x-p_i)^2 = \frac{\kappa}{2}d^2(x;\partial\Omega_1),$$

for all $x \in [\frac{p_i}{2}, \frac{p_i+q_i}{2}]$ and $i \in \{1,...,N\}$.
We will prove $w^+(x) = \frac{\kappa}{2}d^2(x;\partial\Omega_1)$ for all $x \in \{1/2 \le \|x\| \le 3/2\}$. Indeed, for any $x_0 \in \{x : 1/2 \le \|x\| \le 3/2\}$, there exist $A_N \in \mathscr{A}$ such that $x_0 \in [0,q_1]$. From the definition of w^+, we have $w^+(x_0) \le w^+_{A_N}(x_0) = \frac{\kappa}{2}d^2(x_0;\partial\Omega_1)$. Conversely, we call $\mathscr{P}$ to be the set of all finite subsets of Ω. Then for any $P \in \mathscr{P}$, there exist $A_N \in \mathscr{A}$ such that $P \subset A_N$ and $x_0 \in [0,q_1]$. Applying Theorem 38, we have $w^+_P(x_0) \ge w^+_{A_N}(x_0) = \frac{\kappa}{2}d^2(x_0;\partial\Omega_1)$. Hence $w^+(x_0) = \inf_{P\in\mathscr{P}} w^+_P(x_0) \ge \frac{\kappa}{2}d^2(x_0,\partial\Omega_1)$.
Therefore $w^+(x) = \frac{\kappa}{2}d^2(x;\partial\Omega_1)$ for all $x \in \{1/2 \le \|x\| \le 3/2\}$.
Thus

$$w^+(x) = \frac{\kappa}{2}d^2(x;\partial\Omega_1) = \frac{\kappa}{2}(\|x\|-1)^2,$$

for all $x \in V \cap \{\frac{1}{2} < \|x\| < \frac{3}{2}\} = \{\frac{1}{2} < \|x\| < \frac{3}{4}\}$.
Let $x_0, y_0 \in \{\frac{1}{2} < \|x\| < \frac{3}{4}\}$ such that $x_0 \in [0,y_0]$, we have

$$\|\nabla w^+(x_0) - \nabla w^+(y_0)\| = \left\| \kappa(\|x_0\|-1)\frac{x_0}{\|x_0\|} - \kappa(\|y_0\|-1)\frac{y_0}{\|y_0\|} \right\| = \kappa\|x_0 - y_0\|.$$

Hence $\kappa \geq \Gamma^1(W^+;\mathbb{R}^n) \geq \Gamma^1(W^+;V) \geq \mathrm{Lip}(\nabla w^+;V) \geq \kappa$, and hence

$$\Gamma^1(W^+;V) = \kappa = 4. \tag{38}$$

On the other hand, for all $x, y \in \partial V$ we have $\|x\| = \|y\| = 3/4$, so that

$$\|\nabla w^+(x) - \nabla w^+(y)\| = \left\| \kappa(\|x\|-1)\frac{x}{\|x\|} - \kappa(\|y\|-1)\frac{y}{\|y\|} \right\| = \frac{\kappa}{3}\|x-y\|.$$

Hence

$$B_{x,y}(W^+) = \frac{\|\nabla w^+(x) - \nabla w^+(y)\|}{\|x-y\|} = \frac{\kappa}{3}.$$

Moreover, since $w^+(x) = w^+(y)$ and $(\nabla w^+(x) + \nabla w^+(y))$ is perpendicular to $(y-x)$, we have

$$A_{x,y}(W^+) = \frac{2(w^+(x) - w^+(y)) + \langle \nabla w^+(x) + \nabla w^+(y), y-x \rangle}{\|x-y\|^2} = 0.$$

Applying Proposition 4, we have

$$\Gamma^1(W^+;\partial V) = \sup_{x,y\in\partial V} \left(\sqrt{A_{a,b}^2 + B_{a,b}^2} + |A_{a,b}| \right) = \frac{\kappa}{3} = \frac{4}{3}. \tag{39}$$

From (38) and (39) we have $\Gamma^1(W^+;V) \neq \Gamma^1(W^+;\partial V)$. And therefore W^+ is not an AMLE of F on $\mathbb{R}^n$.
The proof for W^- is similar. □

Remark 31. With the same notation as in Proposition 30. For brevity let us denote $w^+ = w^+(F,\Omega)$ and $w^- = w^-(F,\Omega)$, by computing directly from the definition, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
w^+(x) &= -w^-(x) = 1 - \frac{\kappa}{2}x^2, \ \forall x \in \{x \in \mathbb{R}^2 : 0 \leq \|x\| \leq \frac{1}{2}\}, \\
w^+(x) &= -w^-(x) = \frac{\kappa}{2}d^2(x,\partial\Omega_1), \ \forall x \in \{x \in \mathbb{R}^2 : \frac{1}{2} \leq \|x\| \leq 1\}, \\
w^+(x) &= w^-(x) = \frac{\kappa}{2}d^2(x,\partial\Omega_1), \ \forall x \in \{x \in \mathbb{R}^2 : 1 \leq \|x\| \leq \frac{3}{2}\}, \\
w^+(x) &= w^-(x) = 1 - \frac{\kappa}{2}d^2(x,\partial\Omega_2), \ \forall x \in \{x \in \mathbb{R}^2 : \frac{3}{2} \leq \|x\| \leq 2\}, \\
w^+(x) &= 1 + \frac{\kappa}{2}d^2(x,\partial\Omega_2), \ \forall x \in \{x \in \mathbb{R}^2 : 2 \leq \|x\|\}, \\
w^-(x) &= 1 - \frac{\kappa}{2}d^2(x,\partial\Omega_2), \ \forall x \in \{x \in \mathbb{R}^2 : 2 \leq \|x\|\},
\end{aligned}$$

where $\kappa = \Gamma^1(F;\Omega) = 4$.
We see that $w = \frac{w^+ + w^-}{2}$ is an AMLE of F on $\mathbb{R}^2$ (although w^+ and w^- are not AMLEs of F on $\mathbb{R}^2$) and $w \notin \mathscr{C}^2(\mathbb{R}^2,\mathbb{R})$. Moreover, all MLEs of F coincide on $\{x \in \mathbb{R}^2 : 1 \leq \|x\| \leq 2\}$ (because $w^+ = w^-$ on $\{x \in \mathbb{R}^2 : 1 \leq \|x\| \leq 2\}$).

From Proposition 30, we know that $W^+(F,\Omega)$ is not an AMLE of F on $\mathbb{R}^n$ in general case. But in some case, we have $W^+(F,\Omega)$ to be an AMLE of F on $\mathbb{R}^n$. We give an example:

Proposition 32. *Let Ω be a nonempty subset of $\mathbb{R}^n$ ($n \geq 2$). Let $F \in \mathscr{F}^1(\Omega)$ such that $\widetilde{\Omega} = \{p - \frac{D_p f}{\kappa} : p \in \Omega\}$ is a subset of an $(n-1)$-dimensional hyperplane H, where $\kappa = \Gamma^1(F,\Omega)$. Then $W^+(F,\Omega)$ is an AMLE of F on $\mathbb{R}^n$.*

Proof. For brevity let us denote $W^+(F,\Omega)$ by W^+. We prove that W^+ is an AMLE of F on $\mathbb{R}^n$. Put $\kappa = \Gamma^1(F;\Omega)$.
From Theorem 47, we have W^+ to be an MLE of F on $\mathbb{R}^n$.
Let $V \subset \mathbb{R}^n \backslash A$. We need to prove $\Gamma^1(W^+;V) = \Gamma^1(W^+;\partial V)$. Indeed, the inequality $\Gamma^1(W^+;V) \geq \Gamma^1(W^+;\partial V)$ is clear, so that we only need to prove that $\Gamma^1(W^+;\partial V) \geq \Gamma^1(W^+;V)$. We have $\kappa = \Gamma^1(W^+;\mathbb{R}^n) \geq \Gamma^1(W^+;V) \geq \Gamma^1(W^+;\partial V) \geq \mathrm{Lip}(\nabla w^+, \partial V)$, so that it suffices to show that $\mathrm{Lip}(\nabla w^+, \partial V) \geq \kappa$.
Let $x_0, y_0 \in \partial V$, $x_0 \neq y_0$ such that $(x_0 - y_0)$ is perpendicular to the hyperplane H.



Figure 4:

Let $\mathscr{P}$ be the set of all finite subsets of Ω. For any $P \in \mathscr{P}$, we have the corresponding function $W^+(F,P,\kappa)$ (defined in Appendix 7.1) or W_P^+ for short. We define K^+ and T_S^+ for $S \in K$ as in Appendix 7.1 with the corresponding definition for the finite set $A = P$. Put $\kappa_P = \Gamma^1(W_P^+;\mathbb{R}^n)$. Since $\widetilde{\Omega} = \{p - \frac{D_p f}{\kappa} : p \in \Omega\}$ is a subset of H and $(x_0 - y_0)$ is perpendicular to the hyperplane H, there exist $S \in K^+$ such that $x_0, y_0 \in T_S^+$. Applying [28, Lemma 21], we have

$$\|\nabla w_P^+(x_0) - \nabla w_P^+(y_0)\| = \kappa_P \|x_0 - y_0\|.$$

Moreover, for any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $P \in \mathscr{P}$ such that $\|\nabla w_P^+(x_0) - \nabla w^+(x_0)\| \leq \varepsilon$, $\|\nabla w_P^+(y_0) - \nabla w^+(y_0)\| \leq \varepsilon$ (by [[28], Proposition 3]) and $\kappa_P > \kappa - \varepsilon$. Therefore

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{Lip}(\nabla w, \partial V) &\geq \frac{\|\nabla w^+(x_0) - \nabla w^+(y_0)\|}{\|x_0 - y_0\|} \\
&\geq -\frac{\|\nabla w^+(x_0) - \nabla w_P^+(x_0)\|}{\|x_0 - y_0\|} - \frac{\|\nabla w^+(y_0) - \nabla w_P^+(y_0)\|}{\|x_0 - y_0\|} \\
&+ \frac{\|\nabla w_P^+(x_0) - \nabla w_P^+(y_0)\|}{\|x_0 - y_0\|} \\
&\geq \frac{-2\varepsilon}{\|x_0 - y_0\|} + \kappa - \varepsilon.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence $\mathrm{Lip}(\nabla w, \partial V) \geq \kappa$. □

7 Appendix

7.1 Recall the constructions of w^+.

Let $A = \{p_1, ..., p_m\}$ be a finite subset of $\mathbb{R}^n$, let $F \in \mathscr{F}^1(A)$ and let $\kappa \geq \Gamma^1(F;A)$.
For $p \in A$ we define:

$$\begin{aligned} \widetilde{p}^+ &\triangleq p - D_p f/\kappa, \\ d_p^+(x) &\triangleq f_p - \frac{1}{2}(D_p f)^2/\kappa + \frac{1}{4}\kappa\|x - \widetilde{p}^+\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

When $S \subset A$ we define

$$\begin{aligned} {d_S}^+(x) &\triangleq \inf_{p\in S} {d_p}^+(x), \\ \widetilde{S}^+ &\triangleq \{\widetilde{p}^+ : p \in S\}, \\ \widehat{S}^+ &\triangleq \text{ convex hull of } \widetilde{S}^+, \\ S_H^+ &\triangleq \text{smallest hyperplane containing } \widetilde{S}^+, \\ S_E^+ &\triangleq \{x : d_p^+(x) = d_{p'}^+(x) \text{ for all } p, p' \in S\}, \\ S_*^+ &\triangleq \{x : d_p^+(x) = d_{p'}^+(x) \leq d_{p''}^+(x) \text{ for all } p, p' \in S, p'' \in A\}, \\ K^+ &\triangleq \{S : S \subset A \text{ and for some } x \in S_*^+, d_S^+(x) < d_{A-S}^+(x)\}. \end{aligned}$$

Proposition 33 ([28], Lemma 3)**.** *Let $S_C^+ = S_E^+ \cap S_H^+$ for $S \in K^+$ then S_C^+ is a point.*

Definition 34. For all $S \in K^+$, set

$$T_S^+ \triangleq \{x : x = \frac{1}{2}(y+z) \text{for some } y \in \widehat{S}^+ \text{ and } z \in S_*^+\}$$

Proposition 35 ([28], Lemma 15,17)**.** *We have $\bigcup_{S\in K^+} T_S^+ = \mathbb{R}^n$ and $(T_S^+ \cap T_{S'}^+)^0 = \emptyset$ if $S \neq S'$.*

Definition 36. $w_S^+(x) \triangleq d_S(S_C^+) + \frac{1}{2}\kappa d^2(x, S_H^+) - \frac{1}{2}\kappa d^2(x, S_E^+)$ for $S \in K^+$ and $x \in T_S^+$.

Definition 37. $w^+(F,A,\kappa)(x) \triangleq w_S^+(x)$ if $x \in T_S^+$.

From [28] we know that $w^+(F,A,\kappa)$ is well defined in $\mathbb{R}^n$, $w^+(F,A,\kappa) \in \mathscr{C}^1(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathbb{R})$ and $\mathrm{Lip}(\nabla w^+(F,A,\kappa), \mathbb{R}^n) \leq \kappa$.

Theorem 38. *We have $w^+(F,A,\kappa) \in \mathscr{C}^{1,1}(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathbb{R})$ with $w^+(F,A,\kappa)(p) = f_p$, $\nabla w^+(F,A,\kappa)(p) = D_p f$ for all $p \in A$ and $\mathrm{Lip}(\nabla w^+(F,A,\kappa), \mathbb{R}^n) \leq \kappa$.*

Further, if $g \in \mathscr{C}^{1,1}(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathbb{R})$ with $g(p) = f_p$, $\nabla g(p) = D_p f$ when $p \in A$ and $\mathrm{Lip}(\nabla g, \mathbb{R}^n) \leq \kappa$, then $g(x) \leq w^+(F,A,\kappa)(x)$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$.

Proof. Applying Proposition 4, we have $\Gamma^1(F;\Omega) \leq \kappa$ if and only if

$$\sqrt{A_{x,y}^2(F) + B_{x,y}^2(F)} + A_{x,y}(F) \leq \kappa, \ \forall x, y \in \Omega,$$

This inequality is equivalent to

$$\frac{B_{x,y}^2(F)}{2M_1} + A_{x,y}(F) \leq \frac{\kappa}{2},$$

and hence it is equivalent to

$$f_y \leq f_x + \frac{1}{2}\langle D_x f + D_y f, y-x\rangle + \frac{1}{4}\kappa\|y-x\|^2 - \frac{1}{4\kappa}\|D_x f - D_y f\|^2, \text{ for any } x,y \in \Omega.$$

Using [28, Theorem 1], we finish the proof of this theorem. □

Corollary 39. *In the case $\kappa = \Gamma^1(F;A)$, let $W^+(F,A,\kappa)$ be the 1-field associated to $w^+(F,A,\kappa)$ then $W^+(F,A,\kappa)$ is an over extremal extension of F on $\mathbb{R}^n$.*

Proof. From [12, Proposition 2.4] we have $\mathrm{Lip}(\nabla w^+(F,A,\kappa),\mathbb{R}^n) = \Gamma^1(W^+(F,A,\kappa),\mathbb{R}^n)$. And so that the proof is immediate from Definition 3 and Theorem 38. □

7.2 The constructions of w^-.

By the same way, we can construct the function w^- as follows.
Let $A = \{p_1,...,p_m\}$ be a finite subset of $\mathbb{R}^n$ and let $F \in \mathscr{F}^1(A)$. Let $\kappa \geq \Gamma^1(F;A)$.
For $p \in A$ we define:

$$\begin{aligned} \widetilde{p}^- &\triangleq p + D_p f/\kappa, \\ d_p^-(x) &\triangleq f_p + \frac{1}{2}D_p f^2/\kappa - \frac{1}{4}\kappa\|x-\widetilde{p}^-\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

When $S \subset A$ we define

$$\begin{aligned} d_S^-(x) &\triangleq \sup_{p\in S} d_p^-(x), \\ \widetilde{S}^- &\triangleq \{\widetilde{p}^- : p \in S\}, \\ \widehat{S}^- &\triangleq \text{ convex hull of } \widetilde{S}, \\ S_H^- &\triangleq \text{smallest hyperplane containing } \widetilde{S}^-, \\ S_E^- &\triangleq \{x : d_p^-(x) = d_{p'}^-(x) \text{ for all } p,p' \in S\}, \\ S_*^- &\triangleq \{x : d_p^-(x) = d_{p'}^-(x) \geq d_{p''}^-(x) \text{ for all } p,p' \in S, p'' \in A\}, \\ K^- &\triangleq \{S : S \subset A \text{ and for some } x \in S_*^-, d_S^-(x) > d_{A-S}^-(x)\}. \end{aligned}$$

Proposition 40. *Set $S_C^- \triangleq S_E^- \cap S_H^-$ for $S \in K^-$ then S_C^- is a point.*

Definition 41. For all $S \in K^-$, set

$$T_S^- \triangleq \{x : x = \frac{1}{2}(y+z) \text{ for some } y \in \widehat{S}^- \text{ and } z \in S_*^-\}$$

Proposition 42. *We have $\bigcup_{S\in K^-} T_S^- = \mathbb{R}^n$ and $(T_S^- \cap T_{S'}^-)^0 = \emptyset$ if $S \neq S'$.*

Definition 43. $w_S^-(x) \triangleq d_S(S_C^-) - \frac{1}{2}\kappa d^2(x,S_H^-) + \frac{1}{2}\kappa d^2(x,S_E^-)$ for $S \in K$ and $x \in T_S^-$.

Definition 44. $w^-(F,A,\kappa)(x) \triangleq w_S^-(x)$ if $x \in T_S^-$.

Theorem 45. *We have $w^-(F,A,\kappa) \in \mathscr{C}^{1,1}(\mathbb{R}^n,\mathbb{R})$ with $w^-(F,A,\kappa)(p) = f_p$, $\nabla w^-(F,A,\kappa)(p) = D_p f$ for all $p \in A$ and $\mathrm{Lip}(\nabla w^-(F,A,\kappa),\mathbb{R}^n) \leq \kappa$.*

Further, if $g \in \mathscr{C}^{1,1}(\mathbb{R}^n,\mathbb{R})$ with $g(p) = f_p$, $\nabla g(p) = D_p f$ when $p \in A$ and $\mathrm{Lip}(\nabla g,\mathbb{R}^n) \leq \kappa$, then $w^-(F,A,\kappa)(x) \leq g(x)$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$.

Corollary 46. *In the case $\kappa = \Gamma^1(F;A)$, let $W^-(F,A,\kappa)$ be the 1-field associated to $w^-(F,A,\kappa)$ then $W^-(F,A,\kappa)$ is an under extremal extension of F on $\mathbb{R}^n$.*

7.3 Domain infinite.

Let Ω be a nonempty subset of $\mathbb{R}^n$ and $F \in \mathscr{F}^1(\Omega)$. Fix $\kappa = \Gamma^1(F;\Omega)$.
We call $\mathscr{P}$ to be the set of all finite subsets of Ω. Applying Theorem 38 anh Theorem 45, for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, and for any $P,P' \in \mathscr{P}$ satisfying $P \subset P'$ we have

$$w^-(F,P,\kappa)(x) \leq w^-(F,P',\kappa)(x) \leq w^+(F,P',\kappa)(x) \leq w^+(F,P,\kappa)(x).$$

So that we can define

$$w^+(F,\Omega)(x) = \inf_{P\in\mathscr{P}} w^+(F,P,\kappa)(x),$$

and

$$w^-(F,\Omega)(x) = \sup_{P\in\mathscr{P}} w^-(F,P,\kappa)(x).$$

Theorem 47. *Let $W^+(F,\Omega)$ be the 1-field associated to $w^+(F,\Omega)$ and let $W^-(F,\Omega)$ be the 1-field associated to $w^-(F,\Omega)$. Then $W^+(F,\Omega)$ is an over extremal extension of F on $\mathbb{R}^n$ and $W^-(F,\Omega)$ is an under extremal extension of F on $\mathbb{R}^n$.*

Proof. Using [[28], Theorem 2], the proof is similar as Theorem 38 and Corollary 39. □

8 Acknowledgements

E.L.G. and T.V.P. are partially supported by the ANR (Agence Nationale de la Recherche) through HJnet projet ANR-12-BS01-0008-01.

References

[1] ARMSTRONG, S.N., SMART, C.K., *As easy proof of Jensen's theorem on the uniqueness of infinity harmonic functions*, Calc. Var. Partial Differ. Equ. 37(3-4) (2010), 381-384.

[2] G. ARONSSON., *Extension of functions satisfying Lipschitz conditions*, Arkiv for Matematik 6 (1967), 551-561.

[3] G. ARONSSON, *Minimization problems for the functional sup$_x$ $F(x, f(x), f'(x))$*, Ark. Math, 6 (1967), 551-561.

[4] G. ARONSSON, M. CRANDALL AND P. JUUTINEN, *A tour of the theory of Absolutely Minimizing Functions*, http:www.math.ucsb.edu, (2003), 439-505.

[5] G.BARLES, J.BUSCA, *Existence and comparison results for fully nonlinear degenerate elliptic equations*, Commun. Partial Differ. Equ. 26(11-12) (2001), 2323-2337.

[6] H.H.BAUSCHKE AND X.WANG, *Firmly nonexpansive and Kirszbraun-Valentine extensions: a constructive approach via monotone operator theory,* Nonlinear Analysis and Optimization I (Haifa 2008), Contemporary Mathematics 513, AMS, Providence, RI, pp. (2010), 55-64.

[7] C. FEFFERMAN, *Whitney's extension problem for C^m*, Ann. Math, 164 (2006, 313-359).

[8] C. FEFFERMAN, *A sharp form of Whithey's extension theorem*, Ann. Math, 161 (2005), 509-577. Ann. Math, 164 (2006, 313-359).

[9] G. GLAESER, *Études de quelques algèbres tayloriennes*, J. d' Analyse math, 6 (1958), 1-124.

[10] G. GLAESER, *Prolongement Extremal de Fonctions Différentiables d'une variable*, J. Approx. Math. Theory, 8 (1973), 249-261.

[11] E.L. GRUYER AND J.C. ARCHER, *Harmonious Extensions*, SIAM J. Math. Anal, 29 (1) (1998), 279-292.

[12] E.L. GRUYER, *Minimal Lipschitz extensions to differentiable functions defined on a Hilbert space*, Geometric and Functional Analysis, 19(4) (2009), 1101-1118.

[13] E.L. GRUYER, *On absolutely minimizing Lipschitz extensions and PDE $\Delta_\infty u = 0$*, NoDEA: Nonlinear Differ. Equ. Appl. 14(1-2) (2007), 29-55.

[14] M.J. HIRN AND E.L. GRUYER, *A general theorem of existence of quasi absolutely minimal Lipschitz extensions*, Mathematische Annalen, Accepted.

[15] R. JENSEN, *Uniqueness of Lipschitz extension: minimizing the sup-norm of gradient*, Arch. Rational Mech. Anal, 123(1993), 57-74 .

[16] P.JUUTINEN, *Absolutely minimizing Lipschitz extension on a metric space*, Annales Academiae Scientiarum Fennicae Mathematica 27, (2002), 57-67 .

[17] J.L. KELLEY, *Banach spaces with the extension property*, Trans. Am. Math. Soc. 72(2) (1952), 323-326.

[18] M.D. KIRSZBRAUN, *Über die zusammenziehende und Lipschitzsche Transformationen*, Fundamenta Mathematicae, 22 (1934), 77-108.

[19] E.J. MCSHANE, *Extension of range of functions*, Bull. Amer. Math. Soc., 40 (1934), 837-842.

[20] E.J. MICKLE, *On the extension of a transformation*, Bull. Amer. Math. Soc, 55(2) (1949), 160-164.

[21] V.A MILMAN, *Absolutely minimal extensions of functions on a metric spaces*, Matematicheskii Sbornik 68(1), (1999), 83-110.

[22] L. NACHBIN, *A theorem of the Hahn-Banach type for linear transformations*, Trans. Am. Math. Soc, 68(1) (1950), 28-46.

[23] A. NAOR, S. SHEFFIELD, *Absolutely minimal Lipschitz extension of tree-valued mappings*, Mathematische Annalen, 354(3), (2012), 1049-1078.

[24] Y. PERES, O. SCHRAMM, S. SHEFFIELD, D.B WILSON, *Tug-of-war and the infinity Laplacian*, J. Am. Math. Soc, 22(1), (2009), 167210.

[25] I. SCHOENBERG, *On a theorem of Kirszbraun and Valentine*, Am. Math. Mon, 60, (1953), 620-622.

[26] S. SHEFFIELD, C.K SMART *Vector-valued optimal Lipschitz extension*, Commun. Pure. Appl. Math, 65(1), (2012), 128-154.

[27] F.A. VALENTINE, *A Lipschitz condition preserving extension for a vector function*, American Journal of Mathematics, 67(1) (1945), 83-93.

[28] J.C. WELLS, *Differentiable functions on Banach spaces with Lipschitz derivatives*, J.Differential Geometry 8 (1973), 135-152.

[29] J.H. WELLS, L.R. WILLIAMS, *Embeddings and Extensions in Analysis*, Springer, Berlin (1975).

[30] H. WHITNEY, *Analytic extensions of differentiable functions defined in closed sets*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc, 36 (1934), 63-89.